THE LIBERATOR.

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE EXTENSION OF THE REPUBLIC.

" The people of England and of all the dominions thereunto belonging are and shall henceforth be a commonwealth and free state without any king or house of lords."—*Declaration of the Rump Parliament, 1649.*

" Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."— *Declaration of American Independence, 1776.*

" Men are born and remain free and equal in right."— *Declaration of the rights of man and the citizen, France, 1789.*

VOL. I.—No. 3.] PARIS. [MAY, 1910.

Int. Instituut
Soc. Geschiedenis
Amsterdam

Published monthly by **Edward Holton James**, 22. Rue Saint-Dominique. Paris.— Subscription : One year, 5 francs or 4 shillings or 1 dollar, post free.

Two events of transcending importance now taking place in our planetary system are Roosevelt's visit to Europe and the appearance of Halley's comet.

THE DEGRADATION OF MARYLAND.

What is to be the fate, social and political, of the American negro ?

Two theories present themselves with regard to this question. One is that political rights should be accorded to the negro on the same terms upon which they are accorded to other inhabitants of the country. The other theory is that the negro is naturally a slave, an inferior being, and that he should not enjoy political rights equal to those of a white man. The second theory is the dominant one in the United States at present. In that country it is to-day unpopular to espouse the cause of the negro. In the drawing-rooms of Boston and New York the negro gets little more than a sneer. The days of Lincoln, Beecher and Summer are no longer remembered. We are living in the days of Morgan and Rochefeller and of trust-imperialism.

Unpopular and hated as the cause of the negro is, we believe that his cause is worth espousing. Every attack upon his rights we regard as an attack upon the republic and every enemy of the negro we regard as an enemy of the republic.

The latest exhibition of the degraded white man's race snobbery comes from the state of Maryland. That state has passed or threatens to pass the most sweeping negro disfranchisement act ever passed in any state.

Favored by nature with unlimited wealth, enjoying privileges, liberties and comforts which are almost beyond the dream of any other nation, these white tyrants of Maryland shamelessly insult and spit upon the principles to which their country was dedicated.

The white democrat of Maryland claims to be superior to the negro but when asked to explain how the public welfare is to be promoted by taking the vote away from an intelligent negro and giving it to an ignorant white man the Maryland democrat cannot answer. His intellect is not sufficiently " superior " to answer that question.

To take the vote away from the negro and at the same time to make the negro pay taxes for the support of the government which takes away his vote is to violate the principle of " no taxation without representation." But here too the Maryland democrat has nothing to answer. Here too his immense superior intellect breaks down.

Some time ago the brotherhood of locomotive firemen and engineers of Georgia wanted to have the negro excluded from the profession of locomotive engineer. The argument was that the " United States was a white man's country." The United States is rather a free man's country, and if the white labor of that country will not accept that principle because it is reasonable and just the day will surely come when it will be shot into them with powder and ball. So long as the white-skinned workingman wishes to keep some one else under he will be kept under himself and deserves to be kept under.

Two enemies threaten liberty in the United States—the trust and the mob. Both are ignorant, both are brutal and selfish, both need to be mastered with a strong hand.

The progress made by the negro since the abolition of slavery has been simply enormous. That is why the lazy white man of the south who prides himself upon being descended from a lazy slave-owning ancestor is afraid to give the negro a fair chance. He wishes to keep the negro down. He wants the north to help him keep the negro down. He wants the sons of the north, the sons of the men who carried the stars and stripes through blood and fire from sixty-one to sixty-four, to help him put the negro back into slavery. *We will not help him.*

Negroes of Maryland, the same government which supinely permits the violation of rights guaranteed to you by the constitution is the same government which ten years ago, in betraying the confidence of the Filipinos who had fought for and gained their liberty against Spain, called upon the whole world to witness the shame of the great American republic.

Cowardly newspapers, cowardly pulpits, cowardly judges, these are your enemies. The white man of the south says that he is superior to you, but a superior person does not prove his superiority by treating other persons as inferiors. A superior person has as a rule very little to say about his own superiority. Go and tell those whites of the south who are seeking to disfranchise you that superiority is a matter of character, not of skin.

Negroes of the south, everywhere put yourselves against the trust and the mob. Put yourselves against that spirit of brawling disorder, ignorance and law-violation which manifests itself daily. Join yourselves to your friends among the white race who love the republic and who stand ready to fight for it. Do not join any political party as negroes and do not form a negro party. Show yourselves as hostile to negro domination as you are to white domination. Make it plain that you are for liberty—for yourselves and for all men. The miserable hoard of bribing, office-hunting political trash in the south who call themselves democrats will learn to respect you and to fear you. They may for a time prevent you from being voters. They cannot prevent you from being patriots. Some-day there will be a democratic party in America that *is* a democratic party.

AN ENGLISHMAN CHAMPIONS THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. E. F. Mylins a British citizen residing in Bayswater, London, has kindly sent to us the following article in favour of establishing a republic in England.

" An opinion prevails that democracies suffer far more than monarchies, whether limited or absolute, from weaknesses and inconsistencies. This view is probably based upon the faults to be found in those ancient democracies of Greece and Rome, which were, as a matter of fact, popular governments in societies based upon slavery. And this analogy, although a false one, is constantly used by the representatives of the aristocratic-plutocratic class ; who, possessing the monopoly of power, are terrified at the advancing wave of republicanism with its cry of " Equal Rights for All," and driven to maintain their immoral position in society by every species of sophism and deceit.

In England to-day, in spite of all the grand things said about Liberty, every institution survives only for the benefit of the aristocratic-plutocratic class, and is the expression not of the suffrage but of the sufferance of the people. The ruling class regard the constitution merely as a vulgar safety-valve for modern unrest, and take good care that if the voice of the industrial democracy is heard, its will shall not prevail.

The king of England, with his hangers on, the lords, are the defenders of every form of tyranny and oppression that the exploiting class have invented to maintain their immoral position as drones in society.

The position of the members of the " lower " house of parliament is ignominious. Every measure they pass on behalf of the people has to be approved by their lordly masters before it can pass into law. The " upper " house of parliament is a conspiracy against the people. It is an insult to their sovereign will and a denial of their sovereign power.

When the " republic " has extended to England, the people will no longer regard themselves as being " under " the government. Every adult will be enfranchised, and every measure passed by the delegates of the people will immediately pass into law without reference to the sanction of an " upper " administration. Thus the administration will be directly under the people.

The " republic " includes as an integral part of its being, the referendum and initiative. The establishment of standing armies and navies is incompatible with modern democracy, as being contrary to the principle of international solidarity, and a menace to the security of other nations and therefore would have to be abolished. Some control of the means of production would have to be secured by the public state, and the whole of the penal code together with the principle of punishment, constructed in the interests of " property " would be obliterated from the statute book.

Every monopoly, privilege and title that has heretofore been the distinctive property of the ruling " caste " would be destroyed.

As safeguards against the " sinister interests " of the elected, the sovereign power to be vested in the people. Their representatives to be delegated and subject to withdrawal at instant notice on the motion of the electors.

For the attainment of a public state, a vigorous propaganda would have to be inaugurated, the following suggestions might be considered.

Exposure of the hypocrisy and meaningless struggles of present-day political parties.

Exposure of the conspiracy existing between political parties for the perpetuation of rule by a privileged caste.

Exposure of the absurdity of electing members to submit measures for the approval of an aristocratic plutocracy.

Exposure of the sycophancy of those who seek election to the Lower House, knowing that the measures they are to vote for, are, if passed, at the mercy of the privileged " caste."

Boycott of the ballot box.

Boycott of state functions, processions and all state employment.

Groups to be formed in various centres for the purpose of spreading democratic ideas, and of initiating occasional strikes of taxpayers, preparatory to a universal strike of taxpayers."

We regard the foregoing article as important for the bold manner in which it asserts the political doctrine of the sovereignty of the people. Up to the present time this doctrine has been foreign to English thought. To give it application means revolution in England. It has been supposed that England possessed a constitution, but in the light of current events it may be permitted to doubt whether or not England has a constitution. One thing is certain. England is going to get a constitution.

We cannot agre with Mr. Mylins in his advice to boycott the ballot-box. How is the initiative and referendum going to be put into operation without the ballot-box ? We take it however that Mr. Mylins does not condemn the ballot-box in a republic established upon the principle of equal rights for all. We interpret Mr. Mylins to mean that he advocates a boycott of those candidates for parliament who, if elected, propose to swear an oath to support the

king. Now, it is obvious that the people of England could elect a rump parliament which would refuse to swear such an oath. Make a candidate declare whether or not he means to swear such an oath.

Richard Mansfield White, of Seattle, Washington writes as follows: "Ça Ira and the Liberator are 'fierce' and while I agree with most in Ça Ira I cannot agree with most in the Liberator. You ask in the Liberator, 'Whom have you on your side, Lord Minto?' Why, my dear boy, he has the Hindus. The Hindus cannot claim the rights of Christianity and at the same time deny Christ. The Hindu and modern Hinduism, and ancient Hinduism too, are on Minto's side."

In answer to Mr. White, we would submit the following facts. The relation existing between Lord Minto's government and the Indians at the present time is precisely identical to the situation which existed between the Roman government and the Jewish people. Christian missionaries have gone to the Indian people with the story that Christ, a Jew, acknowledged the rightful authority and sovereignty of the Roman emperor. This they have held out to the Indians as the basis of what they called Christianity. These missionaries have held out to the Indians a religion of slavery and they have asked the Indians to accept this religion of slavery. The Indians refused to accept it and we applaud them for having refused to accept it.

We contend that the story of the missionaries is historically false. It has been proved to be false by the higher criticism. Christ never accepted nor admitted the authority of Caesar.

It is not the Hindus who have denied Christ. It is the missionaries who have denied Christ. Like Judas, they have sold Christ in order to invent a plausible excuse for robbing oriental peoples by Roman methods. We applaud the Hindus for refusing to accept Christ at the hands of impostors who have falsified the facts with regard to the life of Christ. If the Hindus ever accept Christ, they will accept him from friends, not from enemies.

—— A patriot is a man who believes in a principle and who fights for a principle.

—— We are in favor of just war and we are opposed to unjust peace.

—— The three republics of England, France and the United States can put an end to unjust war because they will be able to put an end to unjust empire and to cut-throat commercialism.

—— No monarchy or empire dare attack a coalition formed of the three republics, England, France and the United States.

—— The republican alliance of England, France and the United States will be able to defend itself against wrongful aggression without the necessity of building any more Dreadnoughts.

—— There are enough staunch and true democrats in England, France and the United States to ensure the triumph of democracy on a world-wide scale.

—— The democrat puts his trust not in the greatness of nations but in the greatness of principles. His patriotism is international.

—— We advise the members of l'*Action Française* (the royalist group in Paris) to emigrate to the other side of the Channel. Their services are no longer needed in France. In England they may yet have a chance to receive another thrashing.

—— We would like to ask the opinion of the learned judges of the court of king's bench upon a delicate legal point. At common-law does sedition to the king also involve sedition to Mrs. Keppel? Blackstone and Coke are silent on this point.

—— The editor of the Liberator heard an Englishman remark the other day that if Lloyd-George had been living in the days of the Stuarts he certainly would have been strung up as a traitor without any ceremony. Our young English friend (he is one of the brightest, most agreeable and altogether charming persons of our acquaintance) added that he would be delighted to take part in stringing up the Welsh nonconformist to the nearest lamp-post. Needless to say, this paper does not approve either of lynchings or assassinations. If any fighting is to be done, let it be done with a decent regard for the rules of civilized warfare. Let the people who don't agree buy guns, organise two opposing armies and fight out their differences on the battle-field. Assassination and lynching are regrettable methods for solving political questions. If we cannot solve our differences by peaceable discussion, let us take to shooting, but let us shoot each other in the face and not in the back.

—— Benjamin Franklin said: When in any country I see men going hungry and land lying idle I know that there is something wrong.

—— When the shadow of the guillotine was hanging over Danton and his friends urged him to fly from Paris, he answered with a patriot's indignant scorn and contempt for danger: "What! Does a man carry his country about with him in his bootsoles?"

—— This paper is opposed to war when the object of the war is to promote imperialism. It favors war when the object is to promote liberty.

—— We have been rather surprised that Ireland has not followed the example of Australia and Canada in offering to present the king with a Dreadnought. With such a present his majesty would be better able to protect Irish liberties.

—— The princes of India do not seem to be princes of patriotism.

—— The government of her majesty, Queen Kepp is enforcing at the present time a very strict censorship of the London stage. We compliment her majesty's ministers upon the efficient manner with which they keep everything in England clean on the outside.

—— In the English church, before a person is confirmed, he is asked by the bishop, What is thy duty towards thy neighbor? To this the person questioned is to answer, among other things, according to the catechism, "To order myself lowly and reverently to all my betters."

As soon as the republic is established, this answer will be amended to read, "To respect the rights of all my equals."

—— The motto of the empire is "conquest." The motto of the republic is "right."

—— General Botha is not our *beau idéal* of a patriot.

—— The English are now intelligent enough to govern themselves without a king.

—— Colonel Roosevelt and General Botha are first-class politicians and third-class patriots.

—— Like the well-known lady in the book of Revelation who sat on top of the seven hills of Rome, Queen Keppel is now sitting on top of the Bristish Empire.

—— In his speech from the throne the king said, "I am sending my son to make an extended journey through my South African possessions, before opening in my name, the first session of the new legislature." Let us hope that, in opening the new legislature on the ground where the Boer republic once stood, "our son" will not be as drunk as he was when he visited our Indian possessions.

The vital issue is not whether the veto of the house of lords shall be suspensive or absolute. The vital issue is not whether England shall have one or shall have two legislative chambers. The vital issue is not whether the length of parliament shall be five years or seven years. The vital issue is whether England shall remain a monarchy or become a republic.

This paper cannot be bought at any news-stand. It is an illegal publication. We have been at some pains to make it illegal. Indeed, we regard its illegality as one of its most attractive features. We have had detectives at work watching the men at Scotland Yard and we are told that at Scotland Yard the Liberator is regarded as seditious. That is a terrible word, sedition. When we hear it, we think of Tower Hill and the gallows and the block where in times past England's patriots offered up their lives for England's liberty.

Do not read this paper in public. If you are caught reading it you will probably be arrested, brought up in Bow Street and God only knows what other horrible thing might happen to you. You might be put into Brixton prison to keep Guy Aldred company. So look out. If you know any one to whom you think the reading of this paper would be a blessing, send us that person's name.

The following lines occur in a letter from a friend in England: "I note that your American correspondent in Rome is somewhat of the same opinion as myself, but of course you cannot expect to satisfy everybody right away. With regard to personal attacks, if you still wish to keep up this attitude, might I suggest a different way of doing it, instead of attacking the debauchery and sensuality of any one person? Why not show the harm and misery caused by these? I think it might be more effective if instead of directly attacking the man, you sympathised with the wife in the suffering she undergoes through the debasement of the husband."

The editor of the Liberator does not wish to show up the debauchery and sensuality of a person. He wishes to show up the debauchery, sensuality and hypocrisy of a system based upon empire and conquest.

In his new book, "The Spirit of America" (Macmillans), Dr. Henry Van Dyke maintains that "The soul of a people has made the American nation." The "republic is not an accident, happy or otherwise. It is not a fortuitous concourse of immigrants. It is not the logical demonstration of an abstract theory of government. It is the development of a life—an inward life of ideals, sentiments, ruling passions, embodying itself in an outward life of forms, customs, institutions, relations—a process as vital, as spontaneous, as inevitable, as the growth of a child into a man."

THE SOCIAL POSITION OF A DUKE.

The newspapers have not favored us lately with any news with regard to the progress of the proposed marriage between Miss Elkins and the duke of the Abruzzi. We hope that if this attractive young American girl ever decides to marry she will have the good sense not to accept the hand of any suitor occupying a lower social position than that of American citizen.

GLOWING TRIBUTE TO ENLGAND'S MONARCH. GUARDIAN OF THE PURITY OF HOME LIFE AND THE SACREDNESS OF MARRIAGE.

The archbishop of Canterbury recently presented the following address to the king.

"We, your majesty's loyal and faithful subjects, the archbishop, bishops and clergy of the province of Canterbury, in convocation assembled, approach your majesty with the dutiful assurance of our devotion to your throne and person.

We are confident that we may rely as heretofore upon the encouragement and help which your majesty will give to the church in its endeavor to strengthen among the citizens of a christian land the bond of christian brotherhood, to guard the purity of home life and the sacredness of marriage, and to ensure that the children of this country shall be brought up in the faith and fear of God."

Gérant, GEORGES PAGNIER, 25, Boulevard Magenta, Paris.

rep., b.

THE LIBERATOR.

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE EXTENSION OF THE REPUBLIC.

" The people of England and of all the dominions thereunto belonging are and shall henceforth be a commonwealth and free state without any king or house of lords."—*Declaration of the Rump Parliament, 1649.*

" Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."— *Declaration of American Independence, 1776.*

" Men are born and remain free and equal in right."— *Declaration of the rights of man and the citizen, France, 1789.*

Int. Instituut
Soc. Geschiedenis
Amsterdam

VOL. I.—No. 5.] PARIS. [JULY. 1910.

Published monthly by **Edward Holton James**, 22. Rue Saint-Dominique. Paris.— Subscription : One year. 5 francs or 4 shillings or 1 dollar. post free.

PRIVILEGED ADULTERY.

" Thou shalt not commit adultery."
The Bible.

Some friends have criticised the Liberator on the ground that it is too fierce. No. 4 was better than No. 3, they say, because it was less fierce. It makes us very unhappy to think that we have been fierce. Our object is not to be fierce. It is merely to be truthful. We do not know why the good God has created minds which look at vital questions from vitally antagonistic positions. We are also astonished at the large number of persons who do not look at vital questions from any position at all. Start a discussion on any vital question and an empty look comes into some persons' eyes and they begin to look queer about the mouth. They would rather not have the gray-matter jolted. They would rather talk about something which doesn't make them think much. There is nothing in the world so costly as thought. However, we do not propose for a minute to give up prying at the nerve-tips of these persons' brains. We shall always try to be gentle rather than fierce, but we may add, however, that when we have occasion to use canon balls we shall not make them out of cotton batting.

We will now approach our subject. It is a delicate text with which to deal, but we will deal with it in a frank, cold-blooded and unemotional way.

Recent events make it entirely clear that in our day that king is the most popular who has the largest number of mistresses.

This statement does not apply to mahomedan kings. It is limited to monarchs who profess the religion of " Christ Jesus " according to the interpretation of the archbishop of Canterbury. Mahomedan kings are allowed a plurality of wives by their religion, but christian kings are obliged to arrange their personal affairs in a different manner, and with *tact.*

What is polygamy ? We will define it as the living together of one masculine unit with a plurality of feminine units. Under mahomedanism, polygamy is *de jure.* The more wives and concubines you have, the more sacred you are. Under christianity it is *de facto.* Christianity holds that polygamy is bad. It has condemned polygamy for nearly 2,000 years, but still *de facto* polygamy is practiced in the most respectable circles. Its highest degree of respectability is reached when it is practiced by a tactful protestant king.

Your successful king will be popular in proportion as he is a good sport. He will not need much intellect but he *must* have all the attributes of a fine bull. He must be able to stock his country with babies. In this respect he will be a patriotic follower of Mr. H. G. Wells' beautiful gospel of " endowed motherhood." When the royal babies grow up they will all have comfortable berths in the army and navy, suitable to their royal blood. Was it Paul or Wells who said : " All things are lawful but all things are not expedient ? " So likewise it may be said of children sprung from the loins of royal sires, they are all natural but they are not all legitimate.

Then again your popular king will know his Paris—not the republican Paris, not the Paris of stern and lofty idealism, of the tricolor, of the barricade, of Lamartine, of Victor Hugo, but the light-hearted, voluptuous Paris, the Paris that produces the smartest mistresses in the world. He will know this Paris by heart, from his hotel in the Place Vendôme to the uttermost end of the scintillating, café-fringed boulevards. Your popular king is never so happy as when, relieved from the burdens of international peace-making, he is spending the night with a well-built, appetising representative of *Le Moulin Rouge* or *Le Bal Tabarin.* Among his majesty's " immediate circle " there will be a choice collection of baronesses and countesses well-spiced like himself who play bridge and baccarat and who " go " in society. His majesty will have a racing stud and he will be of course a staunch supporter of the established church and, finally, he will have a *chic* collection of actresses who do not go in society and who never go to church.

The idea that a christian monarch is limited to one consort is entertained only by persons who get their

picture of life from reading the marriage-ceremony in the prayer-book. That a christian king is limited to one feminine companion is what lawyers call a "constitutional fiction." It is a king's business to "honour" many ladies. Thus under the practical working of the established church, your popular sovereign has all the spiritual advantages of being a christian (he has his soul saved) and all the fleshly advantages of being a mussulman.

The British constitution strictly ordains that the monarch shall be protestant. Ask any legal professor at Oxford or Cambridge and he will tell you that it is much more important that the monarch be protestant than that he be virtuous.

This is true British comfort—for kings.

Once upon a time there lived a man who was a remarkable political leader. He possessed the qualities which fascinate and gain the confidence of the people. He made himself the champion of a just cause. He made himself the defender of a large number of people who were the helpless victims of tyranny. Thousands of justice-loving people prayed for his success. He was called "the king without a crown." But at the very moment when his popularity was at its apex, his good name became contaminated by the foul breath of scandal. His name was dragged into the divorce-court. He was cited as co-respondent in a divorce case. Public opinion at once turned against him. His old friends forsook him. It was a very respectable country and the pillars of church and state pointed at him the finger of withering scorn. Down, down, like Lucifer cast out of heaven, he fell. Deserted and disgraced, the king without a crown slunk away into the dark and died of a broken heart.

That man's name was Parnell.

Parnell ought to have been a king with a crown. Then all would have been pardoned. When he died, the newspapers would have proclaimed "What a great peacemaker, statesman and king!" The favorite mistress (another man's ex-wife) would have been invited to come and weep over the bier. All the kings of Europe would have attended the funeral. Olympian Roosevelt would have been there, marching at the head of the royal grooms and puffing hot air.

That which the respectable world condemned and punished in Parnell it justifies and pardons in a king. Here were two men whom God made equal and subject to the same law. Man made them unequal and relieved one from the law which was enforced against the other.

It is said that all nations who have kings do the same thing. They will not do it when the republic is established.

Not long ago, Father Vaughan, a catholic priest in London, denounced from his pulpit the immorality of certain English country-houses. King Edward caused word to be conveyed to Father Vaughan that such disclosures would have to stop. "Such tales are not good for the people. They tend to weaken the people's respect," that king is reported to have said.

Monarchy cloaks, disguises and dissumulates its evils in order that its privileges may continue to exist. "Do not root out the evil. Cover it up:" that is the sum and substance of what king Edward said to Father Vaughan.

It were better for Father Vaughan to tie a millstone around his neck and drown himself in a sea of sour piety, in an ocean of stagnant respectability, rather than that, by his words, a blush of shame should be brought to the cheeks of England's haughty aristocracy.

If this is the meaning of aristocracy, then of all broken and despicable reeds, aristocracy is the most broken and despicable reed that the righteousness of a nation ever had to lean upon.

Monarchy, with its crowned and spangled mediocrities, its mental inferiority, its manufactured glamor, its bacchic proclivities, its artificial rule for measuring human value, its morbid craving for luxury and class-distinction, its hatred of truth and love of ritual, its frigid indifference to questions of social justice, needs to be combatted in the new world as well as in the old. Heathenism is still with us, with divine Augustus at the head of it. Emperor-worship is as resplendent and insolent in New York and London as it was in Rome and Jerusalem in the day of Christ. Young American "buds" with *Rue de la Paix* dresses and peacocks' intellects are eager to appear at the British court and "do homage" to the royal person. The royal person has become a sort of garlanded social Baal which obligingly offers itself to the worship of the Babylonian society leaders of both branches of the Anglo-Saxon race.

It was said that Edward Hanover was a popular man. So he was. He did more to make adultery popular in England than any other gentleman in the nineteenth century. We do not believe it did him any good to be a king, or anybody else any good. We pity any man who has the misfortune to hold the degraded office of king.

An Englishwoman, devout and loyal, remarked recently that it was a good thing for England when Edward came to the throne and let down the bars a little in the matter of morality. Victoria had been too strict. This remark revealed monarchical England's social immorality in its last stages of putrefaction. This woman was in every respect an exemplary person, except in thought. Her thought was diseased, and her moral perspectives were twisted. She put loyalty higher than truth. She had been to church too much.

Mr. Rudyard Kipling has told us a great deal about the white man's burden—how we white men ought to govern the heathen. Let us by all means hasten to carry to the hindu and the children of Islam our blessed gospel of privileged adultery.

We hear it said that the puritans ought to put a stop to privileged adultery in England. Why, dear innocent reader, there haven't been any puritans in England since Cromwell died, not since the ritualistic king-worshippers threw his bones out of the Abbey

to make place for duchesses who were proud to be the bastards of Charles the second.

If you are a king-worshipper or an "homage-doer," look out for another Cromwell with a big stick. Perhaps the time of the puritans is coming round again. The church (king-subsidised) with its corps of sleek and pious whitewashers paid to whitewash the sins of the rich (Father Vaughan and a few others excepted) is rotten. It is a whited sepulchre, full of hypocrisy, dead men's bones, ruined families and broken hearts. Let the established church and the monarchy be cleared away, nailed up in a coffin and put under ground. Then we shall be in better shape to carry to the heathen at home and to the heathen abroad our christian doctrine of *what is right.*

HAIL, "LIBERATOR!"

To the Editor of the Liberator.

Dear Sir :—

Let me congratulate you most cordially on "The Liberator." In bulk it may seem insignificant enough ; but it is entirely *sound*, and that is the main point. It has in it, I feel sure, the proverbial potency of the mustard-seed. To me, as to you, the gospel of the Universal Republic—the United States of the World—seems to be "the only doctrine which is big with growth and promise moral and religious as well as intellectual."

Nor do I think your appreciation of Keir Hardie excessive. At any rate, he is leagues in advance of the other alleged "Labor Leaders." I have noted professionally his sayings and doings, since his very first appearance in the arena of public affairs, and being, reputedly at least, *doyen* of the democratic press of Great Britain, I may he supposed to speak with a measure of authority. Hardie is a far-seeing politician ; but he is much more. He is a prophet-democrat of the incomparable old Hebrew school of Amos and Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zechariah. He quite comprehends what He of Nazareth meant when He declared :—

> The princes of the Gentiles bear dominion over them and their great ones exercise authority upon them ; but so it shall not be among you. But whosoever will be great among you, he shall be your minister. And whosoever among you will be the chiefest shall be the servant of all.

Yet even Hardie, though he well knows that no man can be a Monarchist and a Christian at the same time, hesitates boldly to unfurl the standard of the Republic on this side of the Channel, fearing lest by so doing he should postpone, or otherwise prejudice, the solution of that pressing economic problem which our Labor Party alleges is generally "forrarder" in monarchical England than in republican America.

But the contention is based on an obvious historic sophism. The United States is not now and never has been much more than a second edition of Anglo-Norman monarchy. Wise and sagacious men forsaw the end from the beginning. Those who drafted the famous American Constitution, in secret conclave, in 1778, consisted of fifty-five friends of the "classes" and only sixteen of the "masses," and against the former the latter struggled in vain. Such, indeed, was the result that Patrick Henry pronounced it "a counter-revolution more radical than that which separated America from Britain" ; while Jefferson yet more emphatically declared that it "sounded the downfall of popular government." Immortal Thomas Paine, whom Roosevelt, playing to the gallery, had the insolent mendacity to call "a filthy blaspheming infidel," went still further, and with the eye of a true prophet beheld the actual Republic of to-day, in the grasp of hollow mercenaries and unconscionable "bounders," like "Big Stick" Theodore, destitute of every one of the noble humanitarian virtues that inspired its origin. In truth, competent authority has recently gone so far as to pronounce the United States "the most conservative country in the world."

Now, where are we to search for the root-evil of a failure so lamentable ? We must go back to the English Revolution of 1648 and sit, for a moment, at the feet of Jerrard Winstanley, "the Digger," England's marvellous seventeenth century Tolstoy. In the "Digger's" day there was one Oliver Cromwell about, with a very "big stick," much bigger than "Teddy's," and here are some of the verities which Winstanley taught Oliver, in his incomparable "Law of Freedom in a Platform."

> Monarchy is two-fold, either for one man to reign, or for many to rule by kingly principles ; for the king's power lies in his laws, not in his name. And if either one king rules, or many rule by kings' principles, much murmuring, grudging, troubles and quarrels may and will arise among the oppressed people, on every opportunity gained. If we go to the lawyer we find him to sit in the Conqueror's chair, though the kings be removed, maintaining the king's power to the height. If we look on the customs of the law itself, it is the same it was in the king's days, only the *name* is altered ; as if the Commoners of England had paid taxes, free-quarter, and shed their blood, not to reform, but to baptise the law into a new name from *kingly Law* to *State Law* : and so as the sword pulls down kingly power with one hand, the king's old law builds up monarchy again with the other.
>
> I have asked divers soldiers what they fought for : they answered they could not tell ; and it is very true indeed they cannot tell, if the monarchical law is established [as in America] without reformation.
>
> Shall men of other nations say that, notwithstanding all those rare wits in the Parliament and Army of England, yet they could not reform lawyer and law, but must needs establish all as the kings left them ?
>
> Will not this blast our honour, and make all monarchical members laugh in their sleeves to see the government of our (English) Commonwealth still built upon kingly laws and principles ?

And "monarchical members" have of late had ample occasion to laugh consumedly at our feckless Laborists in Parliament, so imbecile as even to punctuate the bourgeois rhapsodies over the wholly apochryphal virtues of the late "Peacemaker," King Edward.

But if I have to choose between Eduardus Septimus Britannicus and Theodorus Primus Americanus, pray give me the alleged "Peacemaker." Otherwise, please let me have as near an approach as possible to "Digger" Winstanley's Law of Freedom in a Platform, and whoever may want Plato's Republic or More's Utopia, Atlantis, the City of the Sun, etc., shall have them for the asking.

Anyhow, success to the Liberator with its heroic proclamation of the Universal Republic "ringing in redress to all mankind!"

Seek ye first the Republic, Religious and Ethical, and all other needful socialisms and communisms shall, without fail, be added unto you.

Very sincerely yours,

J. MORRISON DAVIDSON.

London, June 22, 1910.

—— We are glad to announce the release of Guy A. Aldred from Brixton prison. Mr. Aldred will resume at once his work of propaganda. Imprisonment is about as ineffective to dampen the soul of an apostle as it was in the days of Peter and Paul. Mr. Aldred will address meetings as follows: Friday June 8th, Lambeth Liberal and Radical Club, 28a Wincott St., Kennington, S.W., at 8 o'clock, subject, "The truth about India." Sunday, June 10th, Brockwell Park, at 3.15 and 6.15, subject, "Paul's plea."

—— We have received several cheering communications which show how the republic is rooting itself in all countries.

Mr. George Davison writes from Harlech, North Wales: "I have to thank you (or perhaps the editor of Freedom) for Nos. 1, 2, 3, of the Liberator. I have pleasure in enclosing subscription for one year. I do not care whether I agree with everything published in the Liberator or with the way of putting it; but I want to give my mite to support whatever stands for free speech and for the abolition of what appears to me to be *unjust and mischievous privilege*. The Aldred case should be an impossibility even in these days."

Mr. J. F. Cragwell, a representative of the colored race, writes from Seattle, Washington, "I think you voice the sentiment of the best class of your people the world over."

Miss Adella Parker, leader of the suffragist movement in the state of Washington, writes, "Without waiting to find a pen I must write you how *much* I enjoy the Liberator. I revel in it. It is *the one* thing worth doing—to *rouse* people to a fight against privilege."

Mrs. Ellen Newman writes from the state of Washington, "Copies of the Liberator have been received and distributed. Let the good work go on! Yours for the emancipation of all peoples."

Mr. Har Dayal, an Indian citizen, editor and republican, writes from Algiers, "I have read with great pleasure the latest number of the Liberator. I hope you will devote more articles to a thorough exposure of the pernicious fallacy that the form of government is a matter of no importance. Ridicule, of which you have already made use in previous numbers, is a good weapon. About England, one point which has to be dealt with is the supposed usefulness of monarchy as a bond of union between the colonies and the mother-country. You know the imperial idea, which is quite sound and good as far as it relates to the various English-speaking colonies, has strengthened the hold of formal monarchy on the English mind. We must show that a republic is as good an empire-builder as a monarchy (taking an empire to be a union of free communities like the English colonies or the United States). I feel keenly that England is the great stumbling-block in the way of republicanism and had England been a republic perhaps free Italy and Greece might have followed her example. I wish you all success."

—— Thus the ringing letters come in on all sides. Mr. E. F. Mylius writes from London: "The present king is showing a hopeless want of tact and blundering frightfully. He paid a visit to Joseph Chamberlain on Saturday which is calculated to upset the whole liberal and radical feeling in the country, as the South African war has not been forgotten. I have been told by one or two people that at the funeral procession the surprising thing was the number of men who did not raise their hats to George fifth. I assure you it gives me pleasure to assist in any way in the circulation of the Liberator, or to do what small work I can in the establishment of the republic. We want the spirit of the republic more than its form and I feel your paper contains that spirit."

—— The republic aims to develop not common men but uncommon men.

—— Our comrade, Satya Deva, an Indian patriot, writes us a fiery letter: "Do you know that your paper has been put under the seditionary ban in India? The hounds keep track of their prey. Fools! They can never devour thought. The French aristocracy tried to imprison thought in the bastille, but with what result? History will repeat the same in India." We are not afraid of the hounds. When they hear the crack of the Liberator's whip they crouch like good hounds.

—— The best way to prevent the American republic from falling a victim to dry-rot is to spread the republic in Europe. Like christianity, the republic has to spread, or else it dies.

—— We have heard of one lady, occupying an enviable position in London in the midst of wealth and fashion, who, after having read a copy of the Liberator, hastened to burn it up, not because she disapproved of its doctrine but "so that the servants shouldn't see it."

—— It is better for you to say what you think and please nobody than to say what you don't think in vainly trying to please everybody.

—— The republic without virtue is a failure. A nation which refuses to adopt the republic because it hates virtue is also a failure.

Le Gérant: GEORGES PAGNIER. Imp. PONROY & Co., 5, rue Saulnier, Paris (9e).

THE LIBERATOR.

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE EXTENSION OF THE REPUBLIC.

" The people of England and of all the dominions thereunto belonging are and shall henceforth be a commonwealth and free state without any king or house of lords."—*Declaration of the Rump Parliament, 1649.*

" Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."— *Declaration of American Independence, 1776.*

" Men are born and remain free and equal in right."— *Declaration of the rights of man and the citizen, France, 1789.*

VOL. I.—No. 6.] PARIS. [AUGUST. 1910.

Int. Institute Soc. Geschiedenis Amsterdam

Published monthly by **Edward Holton James**, 22, Rue Saint-Dominique, Paris.— Subscription : One year, 5 francs or 4 shillings or 1 dollar, post free.

IRELAND AND THE REPUBLIC.

A great many people would like to know where the Irish members of the house of commons are going to stand on the question of abolishing the English monarchy. There are 71 Irish nationalists and 10 Irish independents in the house of commons. Are these men republicans or are they monarchists ? The expense of electing these Irishmen to parliament was something over £10,000, a sum given by friends in America. The friends in America would doubtless feel that they were getting something back for their money if they could know that at least some of the men elected were republicans.

At a meeting addressed by Mr. Redmond in Cork last May, the United-Irish League and the All-for-Ireland League came to blows. Excitement ran high, the rival leagues hooting, groaning and brandishing sticks at each other. A dozen politicians had to be taken to local infirmaries. This incident vividly illuminates the weakness of Ireland—lack of cohesion coming from lack of political principle. The Irishmen do not know what they want. They haven't apparently a very distinct idea whether they are monarchists or republicans.

At this same meeting Mr. John Redmond said (according to the Paris Daily Mail, May, 23) :

" There is one thing to be deplored in the present political situation and that is the momentary check which has been caused by the death of the king. I think everybody of all parties in Ireland was sorry for his death. He never showed any hostility to Ireland—an unusual thing in a British sovereign—and the general feeling in this country, I think, was that he was a frank, manly and friendly sovereign. We are all sorry for his death and sympathise with his family and with the English people."

Leaving aside the personality of king Edward (we persistently refuse to deal with the personality of any individual or to pass any verdict of praise or blame upon any individual on account of that individual's personality) we wish to point out that this language of Mr. Redmond is the language of a monarchist. Mr. Redmond says that the late king never showed any hostility to Ireland. But why should he show any hostility to Ireland ? It is the system which the late king officially represented which showed hostility to Ireland. As a man the late king showed no hostility to Ireland. Also as a man he showed no hostility to India, South Africa and Egypt. He was friends with all. That was his business and he did his business well. So long as kings can keep men like Mr. Redmond and Mr. O'Brien " loyal," kings are doing their business well.

In the same speech Mr. Redmond said : " The king of England is a constitutional monarch. He is the head of a free constitution. He governs through ministers elected by the people."

We would like to ask Mr. Redmond to point out to us this " free constitution." Let him put his finger on it. Who keeps it ? Does this free constitution recognise the rights of English women ? When and where was it made ? Was it ever ratified by the people ? What is a constitution ?

A constitution is the conscious act of a people's will. It is a statement of the supreme law made by the people. You cannot say that a constitution exists unless you can show that constitution is the free act and deed of the people and of all the people. More than this, a constitution must be kept vital if it is to remain a constitution. A constitution which was the free act and deed of a people a hundred years ago may not be for the descendants of those people a free and vital constitution to-day. A constitution is not a constitution unless it fully and completely represents what the people want and will to-day.

We will no longer be content with the dictums and the fictions and the dusty theorems of Oxford professors in this matter. Oh ye juridic lights of inner and outer temples, explain this matter to us, we pray you. Show us your vaunted constitution. Read to us its language. That is what we want. Is your constitution a reality or is it a rainbow ?

Continuing his speech at Cork, Mr. Redmond said : " The moment we get a free constitution in Ireland,

the people of Ireland—and they are, by feeling and instinct and nature a loyal people, will become the firmest, the most loyal supporters of the free constitution which they possess."

If this is not a shuffling of words, Mr. Redmond means that the Irish nation is at heart monarchist and not republican. Give the Irish home rule, he says, and the Irish will be the most loyal subjects of the English king. Give the Irish home rule and the Irish will at once become loyal subjects and do all they can to support the nefarious rule of the British emperor over the prostrate peoples of India and Egypt.

We wonder whether the Irish friends in America who gave ten thousand pounds to elect Mr. Redmond and his followers understand patriotism and civic duty and republican principles in this manner.

Are the Irish-Americans, who gave this money to elect Mr. Redmond, republicans at heart or are they like Mr. Redmond monarchists at heart? And will they go on giving money to help Ireland send monarchists to the British parliament?

Mr. William O'Brien is not much better than Mr. Redmond. Speaking at Clonakilty on June 19, he said that a wise statesman would accept the conference as a wise method of saving the three kingdoms from a grave constitutional peril.

The three kingdoms! That is an interesting idea. Is Ireland then going to set up doing business as a kingdom as soon as she gets home-rule? Who is going to be king, Mr. Redmond or Mr. O'Brien?

The time has come for light to enter the minds of the Irish. Let them stop clubbing each other with brick-bats. Let them present a solid front in favor of republican principles.

What Ireland needs are men of principles. She has had too many parliamentary politicians. Mr. Redmond is not asserting principles. He is merely trying to put the unionists in a hole. Ireland will never beat England in trickery. The wrong which England has done Ireland—or rather the wrong which kingly principles have done to both England and Ireland, is never going to be avenged by any policy of trickery, vote-swapping or parliamentary compromise.

WOMAN AND THE REPUBLIC.

We have often been extremely pained to observe that the defenders of monarchy as it was exemplified in king Edward are women.

We do not care anything about king Edward personally, but we will add that we had only the kindliest feelings for him personally. We reiterate that we attack institutions and never persons. We cite king Edward merely as a type. In the social laboratory we may dissect and analyse his or any other king's life, the influences which surrounded him and the education which guided him, as a specimen of what monarchy produces, without attaching the slightest blame to him personally.

Our thesis is that monarchy prostitutes woman. Prostitution exists in republics too. But at the same time, you do not find presidents at the head of republics spending their time prostituting women and practically saying to the world that it is right to do so.

One would think that prostitution was an evil from which woman suffered more keenly than man, but is it not surprising when we see large numbers of educated, refined women, *pretending to be emancipators of their sex*, condoning by their silence or actually defending a king who to the knowledge of the whole world was engaged in prostituting and debauching women all his life?

From a man's point of view this is the disappointing and disheartening thing about woman—her inability to lift herself from a prostrate moral position, her inability to form a public opinion, her passivity in the face of facts and acts and social standards which degrade and insult her sex, her lack of intellectual stamina and confidence to speak against those acts of insult from which her sex is daily and hourly the victim.

It is incredible how women who want to lift their sex can defend monarchy, an institution the whole tendency of which is to put woman back into a harem.

We see women-suffragists making in England a great uproar about their rights. But these suffragists in England never breathe one word against the British monarchy, yet they well know in their heart of hearts that no institution in Britain has done so much to prostitute and degrade woman, to keep her down, to prevent her from developing her mind, to keep her in the roll of man's house-keeper or his slave or his play-thing, as the British monarchy and all the sub-structures of conservatism which exist for the sole purpose of protecting and guarding that monarchy.

The English woman wants freedom but she will never get freedom so long as her national sense of citizen-ship, of her becoming a *citoyenne*, consists simply in a sentiment of stuffy and unreasoning loyalty to a throne. Loyalty is good but the woman who would be free must learn how to be loyal to a principle. She must learn how to think—to think in a straight line towards a principle and when she has reached the principle to act upon it.

Woman in England wants freedom and she will get freedom when she realises that the monarchy does not represent *her* nor *her rights* nor her longings and *ideals*; when she realises that for her the monarchy is an immoral institution not representing the England in which she is seeking to be *citoyenne*.

The English suffragists *instinctively know* that freedom for them lies in the republic but this instinctive feeling has not yet been formulated for them. Lord Curzon said recently to the women's anti-suffrage league: "In view of the great activity shown by the supporters of woman suffrage it is time that those of us who oppose a measure injurious to women and

harmful to the state should equally organise and demonstrate."

How does Mr. Curzon know that woman's suffrage is injurious to women ? He doesn't know it. Women's suffrage is a menace only to men and women who want to perpetuate the general scheme of kings' morals and kings' pleasures. Mr. Curzon is perhaps one of these persons. He is not concerned at all about the " interest of women." Mr. Curzon's body is alive and walking about in England to-day but the Curzon mind is in the feudal ages.

How does Mr. Curzon know that woman's suffrage will be " harmful to the state " ? He does not know this either. He would have been quite right had he said that woman's suffrage will be harmful to the monarchy. The state is not the monarchy. Woman's suffrage will be harmful to a monarchical state but it will help a republican state. Mr. Curzon does not want a republic because as we have said, while he honors us by the presence of his body, his mind is back in the feudal ages.

While Mr. Curzon represents the old and sour ideas of feudalism on one side, we confess we do not get very much prophetic light from social reformers on the other side.

What we reproach the modern reformer with is not the fact that he rejects sham religion. What we reproach him with is the fact that he fails to discriminate between sham religion and true religion.

The trouble which we find with most of the reformers and so-called revolutionists of the present day is that they have no moral principles. They have no absolute standards of right. They are elephantine embodiments of infidelity and scepticism. They want to emancipate woman and raise her to an equality with man but they will not teach anything to make man live up to his marriage contract, and they seek to destroy, by doctrines of divorce and free-love, monogamous marriage which is and always has been woman's great fortress of defence. Thus these social reformers are inconsistent and being inconsistent they are impotent. They are forever shooting forth tracts and pamphlets but the sober-minded people never have taken and never will take these non-moral and non-religious reformers seriously. And when we speak of these reformers as non-religious we do not mean that they are non-religious because they are not church-members. The truly religious man takes his religion not from the pope at Rome nor from the archbishop of Canterbury, but he takes it from his own conscience. He takes it from the voice of God which is within him. He finds in the voice of God within him his standard of absolute right, and he will act by that standard in spite of all kings, popes and archbishops. This is the essence of Christianity. This doctrine is the soul of the gospels. And it is people who have this doctrine and who live by it who will form that republic which the Liberator would see established.

ROBERTSON JAMES.

Born in Albany, New York ; died in Concord, Massachusetts, July 4, 1910.

He fought in the great war against slavery. He was the youngest officer who went from the state of Massachusetts. He commanded colored troops, many of whom were escaped slaves. He always testified to the bravery and fidelity of the colored man. He loved the republic for he understood its ideal and none was more ready to protest against foul crimes committed in the name of the republic than he.

He had the justly proud spirit of a soldier who has fought for a principle and he despised the ignoble and sordid manhood produced by a money-making age in which the love of liberty had died out.

Twelve days before his death, he wrote :

" I often wonder how the money-makers live with their sodden brains and witless lives, which are apparently never visited with an emotion for beauty or art of any kind."

He had in him the refinement of soul which is given to those who once have fought, either with pen or sword, against slavery.

May the great war in which he served live forever in the hearts of men and mark by a line of fire the difference between war which is glorious and war which is infamous.

May the soul of this soldier rest with God in peace. May the flag of the republic decorate his grave. May the memory of him and of his comrades who fought against slavery be kept green by those to whom God gives, from age to age, the guardianship of liberty. As the winter snows alternate with the summer flowers upon the graves in the New England graveyards where are buried the soldiers who once answered to the call of Father Abraham, may that war be remembered and may liberty be remembered and may human equality be remembered.

THE POLITICAL BANKRUPTCY OF THE ENGLISH MONARCHY.

By Edward E. F. Mylius, of London.

Once we realise the nature of the alliance existing between monarchical and plutocratic rule, and the scarcely-concealed contempt bestowed by the aristocracy on the class that tolerates its supremacy, it becomes more and more apparent that the monarchy is one of the great stumbling-blocks in the path of England's progress. The difficulties of wresting even a meagre instalment of economic justice from the king and peers, have rarely been more strikingly exemplified, than in the resistance shown by the feudal landlords in the supreme legislative chamber to the initial step made in the English Budget for 1909-10, towards the confiscation of their rent-rolls by the exaction of a tax on land-values.

We do not wonder that the ruling classes are now

concentrating all their efforts upon the conservation of monarchical rule, since by that rule alone can they maintain their own class interests and privileges ; neither are we surprised when pessimistic plutocrats, like lord Rosebery, gloomily predict the break-up of the constitution, as that break-up involves not only the destruction of great landed estates at home, but also the overthrow of the Imperial policy of aggrandization abroad—a policy which has caused the name of England to become a by-word among republican people for injustice and oppression.

There exist sufficient causes which account for the waning popularity of the monarchy in England today. Women and men are beginning to ask themselves why they should be bound to a throne that has ever been indifferent to their hardships and struggles ; that has idly toyed with the destinies and encouraged the exploitation of subjugated races, whilst it battened upon the ignorance and poverty of the people at home; and that has always thrown the weight of its influence on the side of the master class in the bitter struggle between capital and labour. If the monarchy had walked in the " Way of Heaven "; if its rule had been inspired by virtue and courage ; if it had endeavoured to mould society upon a basis that would have established justice for a foundation and love for a law, it would have obtained the regard and affection of a justice-loving people. But the monarchs of England and their advisers have ever gone the other way ; they consistently chose the broad path—the path of luxurious ease and indolent pleasure—with the result that the social fabric now vibrates and trembles with the advance of a coming revolution.

But the factor which militates most strongly against the continuance of monarchical rule in England at the present time, is the uneasiness which is growing in the minds of the English people at the continued unjust occupation of India and Egypt, contrary to the obvious desires and interests of the inhabitants of those countries. In India, the ruling few have placed a man at the head of affairs who possibly knows as much about government as any man living. It is the aim of this modern Machiavel to govern India, not to benefit the Indian people, but to establish a policy whereby England may continue to extract from that unhappy land as much treasure in the future as it has secured in the past. We know that in their hunger-lust for power and dominion the English emperor's minions and their hirelings have not scrupled to adopt measures for the suppression of speech and freedom in India, which for brutality and cruelty have not been exceeded even by that torture-loving ally of the English monarchy—the czar of all the Russias.

The rule of privilege and plunder endures because the voice of the English people has been long smothered by an hereditary and feudal despotism no longer in harmony with their lives. But the spirit of The Republic is beginning to manifest itself in many ways. The days of the monarchy are numbered !

The nation that fêted Garibaldi ; that harboured Mazzini ; that swept from office those men who, bereft of honour, country and conscience, deluged the veldt of South Africa in blood, will not servilely continue for ever to kneel before a king and aristocracy avowedly opposed to the glorious principles of liberty and equality.

Well may the English people consider whether the crown they have patiently borne has not proved itself to be rather a crown of thorns than an emblem of glory ; and that, as Jesus the Nazarine was crucified between two thieves, so the English are now crucified between a thieving aristocracy that have usurped the common lands of the people ; and an imperialistic bureaucracy laden with plunder wrung from weaker states by a policy of force and fraud.

—— Self-respecting Frenchmen who have inherited titles from ancestors are dropping them nowadays. They prefer to be Frenchmen without titles rather than aristocrats without a country. If you meet a Frenchman flaunting a title, put him down for a cad.

—— This paper has no more sympathy with the enlightened selfishness of organised labor than it has with the enlightened selfishness of organised capital. We are hopelessly out of sympathy with selfish people.

—— If the boy-scout movement is a good thing in England why is not it a good thing in India ? Someday the republic will have boy-scouts. They will take care of the Germans. The boy-scouts in France took care of the Germans when the latter led by the insolent duke of Brunswick tried to put down the French republic in 1792. The boy-scouts in France were called *La Garde Nationale.*

—— The grand cordon of the order of Christ has been conferred by Manoel of Portugal upon sire George of England. Christ the democrat ought to feel honored.

—— We have to thank London " Freedom " for putting us on our guard against the English social-revolutionists " who wear black ties for dead kings."

—— Citizen J. Morrison Davidson writes from London : " The Liberator is immense—not an irrelevant sentence throughout—but how to get it make known is the problem."

—— Guy A. Aldred writes : " I cannot agree with you upon the question of a republican written constitution." Now this is an extremely vital question. Perhaps Mr. Aldred will write more at length upon this question. Can there be a republic without a written constitution ? Must there not be a declaration of rights ? Was not Magna Charta a sort of primitive written constitution ?

—— William Jennings Bryan recently took afternoon-tea, in a very quiet and modest manner, with a few members of parliament, on the terrace of the house of commons. We have not learned that Mr. Bryan has yet applied for membership in the Roosevelt Royal Mutual Admiration Society.

Le Gérant : GEORGES PAGNIER. Imp. PONROY & Co., 5, rue Saulnier, Paris (9e).

THE LIBERATOR.

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE EXTENSION OF THE REPUBLIC.

" The people of England and of all the dominions thereunto belonging are and shall henceforth be a commonwealth and free state without any king or house of lords."—*Declaration of the Rump Parliament, 1649.*

" Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."— *Declaration of American Independence, 1776.*

" Men are born and remain free and equal in right."— *Declaration of the rights of man and the citizen, France, 1789.*

VOL. I.—No. 7.] PARIS. [SEPTEMBER, 1910.

Int. Instituut Soc. Geschiedenis Amsterdam

Published monthly by **Edward Holton James**, 22, Rue Saint-Dominique, Paris.— Subscription : One year, 5 francs or 4 shillings or 1 dollar, post free.

CONSTITUTIONS, WRITTEN AND UNWRITTEN.

Is it possible to organise a republic without a written constitution ?

A constitution, in the broadest sense in which the word can be used, is the plan upon which the government of any nation is constituted. In this sense Russia has a constitution as truly as has England.

But there is a more narrow and a technical sense in which the word constitution is used. In this narrower sense it is generally applied to an instrument in writing which has been established as a guarantee of popular rights and liberties. The magna charta and the bill of rights were constitutions in this sense.

In the middle ages there were, generally speaking, no written constitutions for the excellent reason that most persons then engaged in politics rarely knew how to write their own names.

As we approach the epoch when written constitutions became general (beginning with the American constitution in 1789) we meet with a new principle, that of the sovereignty of the people. At first it is introduced very timidly.

This principle was the centre of that whirlwind of revolt which swept away the ancient *régime* in France and which was felt through the length and breadth of Europe during the closing years of the eighteenth century.

The sovereignty of the people, what does that mean? It means that somewhere, in the rank and file of any nation is vested the untrammelled power to make the law. It is a national principle, and it does not mean that the rank and file of one nation shall have the right to make the law for the rank and file of another nation.

Thus, the written constitution as we know it in the last 125 years, always affirms or tends to affirm an abstract *principle*, that is to say, something which is perceived by the pure reason.

The unwritten constitution, as it exists in countries where a written constitution does not exist, affirms *tradition*. The unwritten constitution knows nothing whatever of the positive principle of the sovereignty of the people. It affirms the negative traditional sovereignty of persons and classes who were dominant in the time of feudalism and if, in countries where the unwritten constitution still exists, the principle of the sovereignty of the people has now and again made a timid encroachment, it is by virtue of *written* charters and liberty-bills wrested by the people from the traditional rulers.

In view of these facts we have not been a little surprised to find Englishmen of professed republican beliefs advocating the unwritten constitution in preference to the written.

Recently Keir Hardie remarked in a speech that he preferred unwritten constitutions, and he also declared that he favored a republic for England. But to us this seems a little misty.

Our friend, Mr. Guy A. Aldred, shares Mr. Hardie's views. He has kindly sent to us the following statement of his opinion :—

" As to the written versus the unwritten constitution I can put the matter in a nutshell. Given a written constitution, its interpretation would be a matter for endless discussion. There would be a struggle between the letter and the spirit. The final decision, for good or for evil, would rest with the *spirit*, the sense of social solidarity, possessed by those who interpreted the constitution. If their sense of social solidarity were weak, the written constitution, instead of creating harmony, would only aggravate the discord. If their sense of social solidarity were strong, they would dismiss the constitution and appeal only to the *finesse* of that sense. Hence it is the unwritten constitution that elevates and remains permanent. The other is transient and disappointing. That is all."

In a subsequent letter Mr. Aldred writes :—

" I adopt Herbert Spencer's attitude as to natural versus artificial organisation. It is quite true that

I favor an anarchist republic. In fact I think that magistrates are monarchical and not republican institutions. Asylums, prisons, etc., seem to me to arise from private property, not from man's original sinfulness. This is about all I have to say. I believe Mr. Krishnavarma is also somewhat indifferent to republicanism, because of his adherence to Spencer's teachings, although he (Mr. Krishnavarma) is not an anarchist. Still I shall look out for your answer in the next Liberator."

In his first letter Mr. Aldred accepts government as an hypothesis, and he argues for a government with an unwritten constitution. In his second letter he rejects government.

In answer to the second letter we will only say that our observation is that men, when left to themselves, instinctively organise themselves into a government. Take away from men every prop and custom of the past, put them face to face with primeval nature in some far-off sea-girt wilderness, and before they have built houses to keep off the wintry winds they will have established a machine known as a government. While the pilgrim fathers, of sainted memory, were yet in the cabin of the Mayflower, before they touched foot to the " stern and rock-bound coast " they chose a governor from their midst.

What they did, all civilized men do. They do it by instinct. It is nature, not artifice.

Herbert Spencer's philosophy, so far as we are acquainted with it, contains nothing to controvert this fact. You may call government natural or you may call it artificial. What the pilgrim fathers did in establishing their little plan of government served their purposes and that was all that they were concerned about.

To come back now to the question of the constitution. Mr. Aldred's chief objection to a written constitution seems to be that " its interpretation involves endless discussion." The history of the American constitution certainly gives very substantial support to this contention.

But is the American constitution, in the fullest sense of the word, a republican constitution ?

Before the civil war, that constitution was so interpreted as to defend slavery. Under that constitution slaves, escaped to the north, were given back to their masters in the south.

To-day, while statues of confederate generals who fought to perpetuate slavery are being unveiled in the capitol at Washington, the constitution, which now pretends to guarantee the political equality of negro and white man, is being shamefully violated in the south, with the criminal and supine complicity of a president and congress sworn to support that constitution.

The constitution itself asserts the sovereignty of the American people. But, in fact, the constitution is regarded as possessing an authority superior to the will of the people. The constitution while asserting the will of the people further asserts quite inconsistently that the people cannot alter or amend that instrument except according to certain conditions and restrictions mentioned in the instrument itself. The conditions required are so complicated that it is generally admitted that amendment is impossible.

The constitution has given rise to endless discussion because in those places where it has failed to give utterance to the will of the people in a clear and complete manner, the people have been prevented by the instrument itself from making that instrument express their will in a clear and complete way.

This defect does not attach to all written constitutions. It does not attach to the French or the Swiss constitution.

That which constitutes the *spirit* of the American constitution is its affirmation of the sovereignty of the people. But its letter comes in conflict with its spirit. It is here that Mr. Aldred's remark is justified. Where the letter is in conflict with the spirit there is only one thing to do—make the letter conform to the spirit.

There is little use in vituperating the men who framed the American constitution. Most of them gave evidence of unusual courage in throwing off the British monarchical government of their day and in establishing a new government. If modern Americans do not like the government which their forefathers left them, they are at liberty to do what those men did, throw it off and institute a better one. The framers of the constitution were much stronger in courage than they were in logic.

The constitution which they drew up commences with the words : " We the people of the United States do ordain and establish this constitution." Here the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people is explicitly affirmed. Now mark the contradiction. The constitution, while asserting the will of the people, further asserts that the people cannot alter or amend this organic law except according to a proceedure outlined in the instrument itself and arbitrarily fixed by the people living in the year 1789.

It is obvious that if the people have the right to establish a constitution at all they have the right to amend it, without any restrictions whatsoever.

The sovereignty of the people existed before the constitution was made and it will exist after the constitution has been forgotten.

The framers asserted the sovereignty of the people and then they proceeded to ascribe limits to that sovereignty in the following language :—

" The congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this constitution, or, on application of the legislatures

of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the congress."

For a specimen of muddy, turgid, clumsy, complicated writing, the above passage has probably rarely been equalled. This passage has proved to be an unqualified failure.

It is this jumbled labyrinth of words, piously regarded still by the Americans as the supreme law of the land, which justifies Mr. Aldred when he makes use of the word " artificial." But let us remark that this constitution is " artificial " not because it is written but because it is self-contradictory.

The purpose of the passage which we have quoted was to make it difficult for the American people to alter the organic law, once that law had been established. In fact, the constitution has been amended only four times. Since 1789, about 2,000 amendments have been proposed, and of these only fifteen have been adopted, and of these fifteen the only ones which were really vital were those which abolished slavery, and these were not adopted constitutionally but as the result of a terrible civil war.

It may be asked if it is not within the province of those who are called upon to frame a constitution to provide a method whereby the people may amend the constitution. Certainly it is. But it is not within their province to put into the constitution a method whereby the people may be prevented from amending that constitution.

If the framers of the constitution of 1789 had a right to ordain that no amendment in future should take place except by a vote of three fourths of the male voters, they could have just as logically put the number at nine tenths or at forty-nine fiftieths. The sovereignty of the people cannot be determinated in this way. It cannot be fixed by any system of numbers.

They who possess the *sense of social solidarity* in a nation are the ones who are vested with the sovereign power in that nation. If they are not invested with the sovereign power by the law of tradition, they will take steps to see that they are invested with it by a law of their own making.

The framers of the American constitution acted in the name of the people's sovereignty, but they attempted to affix limits to that sovereignty. A sovereignty can know no limits. When sovereignty ceases to be absolute it ceases to be sovereignty. It was the people's sovereignty which established the constitution and not *vice versa*. Yet superstition has crept in and the American people to-day recognise the constitution as a force superior to their own sovereignty. Led by superstitious reverence for the past, they accord to the constitution a sacrosanct or idolatrous value which is not derived from juridical principles but from the negative force of tradition, custom and time.

There is however one force which will break down any tradition or any custom, and that is the irresistible force of creative thought.

You may be perfectly sure that no existing despotism and no despotism which will ever exist can stand against the force of creative thought. It is for this reason that the men who *think* (and they are rare) are the real men of action. They are the men who make history because they are the men who inspire. Back of every great movement in the annals of the race ; back of every invention, law, institution, religion ; back of every famous poem and picture ; back of every glorious victory in politics or in war, there was an original thinker.

Under a monarchy, an unwritten constitution, such as the English, may work very well. But it is and must remain monarchical. It is a remnant of the military age. It is an utter stranger to the sovereignty of the people. They who wish England to continue under this constitution are forever talking about war and the necessity of building new battleships. But say that the English wish to cut loose from these archaic notions of national greatness and proclaim the sovereignty of the people. This leads to the republic. After you have got rid of the military class (represented by the king, his aunts and cousins and the aristocracy which looks to the army and navy for a " career ") how are your industrial classes going to organise the republic ? This is the practical question which we wish to put to Mr. Hardie and to Mr. Aldred. When a railroad company or any trading association is formed the first thing done is to adopt a constitution and bye-laws. The same thing holds good when it comes to adopting a people's government.

If India were to become independent to-morrow, could she institute a government which would be a " going concern," which would be recognised by other governments, without formulating a written constitution designating who the agents of that government were and how they should be appointed ?

The very thing that India is seeking to escape from to-day is the distressing condition of not having a written constitution. The Indians may not be republicans. They may have a prejudice against the word republican. But we think that they never will taste liberty so long as they have a prejudice against

republican principles as those principles were understood by Washington and Lincoln.

Dynamite bombs and assassination may be necessary to clear away the existing government. They will not be sufficient to create a new government.

It appears to us that few people seem to realise what it means for a nation to turn away from a monarchy and to adopt a republic. Some Englishmen seem to think that for England this process would simply mean a change of labels. Sometimes we hear it said that England is already a republic "with an hereditary president." Such statements are plausible and deceiving. Without the principle of the sovereignty of the people recognised and understood and drilled into the corner stone of the law, you cannot have a republic.

When you change from a monarchy to a republic you are breaking with a thousand years of tradition. Do not imagine that it is a mere changing of labels. You go to the roots of your society, you tear up old institutions and you plant new ones. You cannot live without institutions.

It has taken a thousand years to make the present unwritten constitution of your English monarchy. Do you think you can wait another thousand years in order to get another unwritten constitution for your working-man's republic ?

Kings always object to having anything reduced to writing. They want to have everything left to their sense of "honour." But if you attempt to organise a people's government without something in writing, the people's government will not last long.

What are you going to put into your constitution ? You will probably put into it the right of women to vote, the guarantee of political equality throughout the British empire, the abolition of a titled aristocracy and of a state-supported church, the abolition of primogeniture and entail. These and many other vital matters will be dealt with in your constitution. You will decide how the laws are to be made, how the highest officers of state shall be named, whether or not the initiative and referendum shall be inaugurated, etc., etc.

You will say that this is a big undertaking. It *is*. You see that it is not quite true that England is already a "republic with a hereditary president." The changing from a monarchy to a republic is about the biggest thing which can happen in our day and you can rest assured that if a republican constitution is once established in England it will be a very much more modern and satisfactory document than is the existing American constitution.

The *spirit* of the American constitution affirms the sovereignty of the people but its *letter* denies it. This contradiction will be avoided when the English constitution comes to be written.

The Frenchmen who in 1875 established the republic found themselves confronted by the practical necessity of adopting a constitution. You cannot have a free government without a constitution formulated in language. The whole ancient regime of royalty and privilege in France was based upon an "unwritten constitution" which of course was no constitution at all.

The French had trying times getting their republic established. For years and years and years they did not see clearly how it was to be done. They kept falling back into the hands of kings who devoured enormous civil lists and who kept talking about their "honour." All that the French were sure of was that they had had enough of kings. They kept all their mind and will-power fixed on that point like grim death and finally they got their republic established and they got it established in writing.

There is no particular excitement in French politics to-day. That country is not menaced by war. No rumblings of revolution threaten the republic. There are economic problems in France just as there are everywhere. But French working-men can go into politics and get what they want. If they do not get what they want it is not the fault of the republic. France is in a condition of tranquility. It is in countries where the political conditions are unhealthy and abnormal that one meets with feverish excitement and wide-spread restlessness. India is in a state of ferment and he would be a dull observer who did not see that, psychologically, the same condition of unrest which exists in India exists in England also.

The republic will come in England just as it has come in France and in the United States. It may not come in our day. But it will come.

Every time Keir Hardie makes a republican speech, every time Guy Aldred or Savarkar go to prison for sedition, every time an Indian Sociologist, a Bande Mataram or a Liberator is printed the coming of the republic is brought a little nearer.

Mr. Aldred has spoken of the sense of social solidarity. We have called the same thing the sovereignty of the people.

The sense of social solidarity, or the sovereignty of the people, is alone the unwritten constitution. It does not need to be written on paper because it is written on the heart of man, whether he lives in India, England, France or America. Let the solidarity of the peoples and nations to which we belong be proclaimed. In its name let us come together from many countries, to organise, to put down the exploitation of one nation by another and to carry that which *we* understand by justice throughout the earth.

Le Gérant : GEORGES PAGNIER. Imp. PONROY & Co., 5, rue Saulnier, Paris (9e).

THE LIBERATOR

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL REPUBLIC.

" The people of England and of all the dominions thereunto belonging are and shall henceforth be a commonwealth and free state without any king or house of lords." — *Declaration of the Rump Parliament, 1649*

" Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. " — *Declaration of American Independence, 1776.*

" Men are born and remain free and equal in right. " — *Declaration of the rights of man and the citizen, France, 1789.*

VOL. II.—N°. 9.] PARIS. [SEPTEMBER, 1911.

Published monthly by EDWARD HOLTON JAMES, 22, Rue Saint-Dominique, Paris. — Subscription : One year, 5 francs or 4 shillings or 1 dollar, post free.

Int. Instituut
Soc. Geschiedenis
Amsterdam

THE STRIKE

England is my native country as well as America. Rioting, blood-shed and civilization are incompatible things in both countries. When I see those things occurring together, it is proof to me that those who are in the position of governors do not know how to govern.

IS MICHAEL CULME-SEYMOUR LOSING HIS MEMORY?

Here are four meetings between his daughter Mary Elizabeth and Mr. George Guelph-Wettin which he denied on the stand.

I At a ball in Portsmouth town-hall on August 21, 1891 (Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle of August 22, 1891).

II Two distinct and separate meetings at admiralty house in Portsmouth, in 1898, one in April the other in June (the Times and the Hampshire Telegraph). The admiral admitted one only. Which one did he admit?

III At admiralty house Portsmouth, on Feb. 27, 1899 (Hampshire Telegraph and Sussex Chronicle, March 4, 1899).

IV At the house of " Mrs. Napier " in Dartmouth, May 6 and 7, 1909 (the Times).

TORPEDO BOAT No. 70.

Did prince George of Wales go over from Gibraltar to Malta in torpedo boat No. 70 at the time when he was in Gibraltar on the Thrush ? What strengthens the supposition that George was not in Gibraltar all the time between June 9 and June 25 1890 is the fact that we cannot find any trace of any functions being given in George's honor at Gibraltar during this period. If George went over to Malta secretly, how did he go there ? This question has been bothering us considerably. He could make this trip very nicely and very quietly on a torpedo boat. He took a torpedo boat with him from Plymouth. On May 23, 1890, we find it stated in the Times that " the Thrush is ordered to tow No. 70 torpedo boat to Bermuda and for this purpose a boom has been fixed across the poop for the towrope to be attached. The torpedo boat will join the Thrush at Devonport ". In the Evening News of Portsmouth for June 24, 1890, was published a dispatch from Gibraltar saying, " Torpedo boat No. 70 paid off and placed on reserve June 14 ". We have not been able to find out why torpedo boat No. 70 did not continue with prince George and the Thrush to Bermuda. Comrade Bradford, who has been looking up this question, says that the following item was published in the Naval and Military record of Plymouth on May 29, 1890 : " The Thrush is lying in the Homoeze just off north corner. It was intended that No. 70 torpedo boat should go with her across the Atlantic and it was to be attached to her, but this intention seems to have been changed and the torpedo boat is to be left at Gibraltar. "

Writing under date of August 13, Mr. Bradford says : " This torpedo boat when in full rig for active war service carries only 16 men and she could manage with 10. The speed of this boat No. 70 was 25 knots per hour, that is, she would do 30 miles in an hour or a little over. The distance from Gibraltar to Malta I take it is about 1 000 miles [it is nearer 1 200 miles — Editor] and steaming for 24 hours at full speed she would cover 730 miles ; but she would not go full speed. She would make it a two days journey because comrade the slower those boats go the less coal they use do you see. Now this boat could cross from Gibraltar to Malta without any escort whatever.

I have that from reliable authority. But she would have to be coaled before she could return. This is certain. This could be arranged very nicely at Malta by George and his pals. We have got on a right sound footing in this case and we must work on this point for all we are worth. We must demand a new trial for Mylius. We have sufficient even now to cause an official enquiry. I am going to do my level best to bring about a new trial. Things are something horrible in England. Yesterday the troops actually fired ball cartridge on people in Liverpool and three were killed. We are, in my opinion, on the verge of a revolution. Royalty needs to have an earthedger or a slip off the map with a wreath to their memory. "

In a previous letter Mr. Bradford wrote :

" I note that you will stay in Rome a little while longer. Let me comrade advise you, if it is possible to get a dip in the sea every day [Rome is forty miles from the sea. *Ed.*]. You will not have that drowsy feeling [the editor never had any drowsy feeling in Rome] and you will sleep a lot better at night. I know how you will feel. I go for a dip in the sea every morning at 6 A. M. and feel a lot better for it. Yesterday morning a poor feller took cramp in the water and we had such a job to get him ashore. He was going down for the 3rd time when we got to him and after a lot of trouble we got him in a boat. I said in my last letter that I had read of people dropping dead in Italy from the heat and I thought of you not being used to extra hot climates. I should feel it very mush if you were taken ill at such a critical moment. "

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

(by the editor).

Sea-shore, France, August 12.

I am lying on my back in a cave on the sea-shore. I have not been so cool since I was in the cave of Neptune in Tivoli. France is tame after Italy. When I was in Rome I thought I might drop dead in the street from the heat, an event which would have caused my comrade Bradford a great deal of unnecessary suffering. I have therefore joined my family on the coast of France, and am taking every precaution to protect my life.

The receding tide has left the inside of this cave as smooth as a billiard table and as cool as the bottom of the sea. I should like to stay here alone all the time, but that would be selfish. I have to wait upon my daughters. I have been obliged to spend a great deal of time since being here in dropping dead flies into the throats of three baby thrushes who occupy a nest in the garden. My daughters catch the flies, squeeze them horribly, then make me stand on a chair, pass the dead flies up to me and make me drop them into the big yellow beaks of the three baby thrushes.

In passing through Paris I wanted to have a meeting with comrade Bradford. So I wrote him to come over. I had never seen any of the comrades on the other side of the channel. I met comrade Bradford at the St. Lazare railway station. We did not have any trouble whatever in recognizing each other. He is a little man, under thirty, very hard and muscular, with pink cheeks, fighting blue eyes, and a magnificent crop of tough Anglo-Saxon colored hair which made me envious. In about two hours I found out that he had his pockets full of puzzles and his head full of poetry. His favorite poem is the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyám, and his favorite piece of music is Schumann's Dream. He made me play this piece to him on the violin every morning that he was in Paris. He is a tee-totaler. I tried to get him to taste a little weak wine at a restaurant in the Latin quarter where Thackery used to dine but he would not touch a drop of it. I had to take him where he could get a cup of good hot tea. That made him feel better and gayer than anything else. On the boat going to St. Cloud an Englishman asked comrade Bradford where to go in Paris to get a good cup of tea. He knew. The English pass about among themselves in Paris information on the subject of tea.

Then it dawned upon me why comrade Bradford is a tee-totaler. He drinks nothing but tea.

We were going by the Eiffel tower in the boat on the Seine and these two Englishmen undertook to tell me that there was a tower in England much higher than the Eiffel tower. This irritated me a little.

I am not accustomed to having Englishmen come over here and tell me that there is a tower in England higher than the Eiffel tower. I did not get excited. I never get excited in arguing with an English person. I keep perfectly calm, perfectly collected, perfectly cool. I calmly took from my pocket a Baedeker's guide to Paris and read out from it that the Eiffel tower was the highest tower in the world. There was nothing more said.

All the time that comrade Bradford was in Paris he kept his pockets full of Liberators and whenever we met an Englishman on an omnibus or other public conveyance my comrade handed the poor man a copy of this illegal publication. It made me feel very uncomfortable.

On Sunday morning at 8 o'clock, while I was playing the violin, the bell rang and in walked comrade Charles Lahr from London. I had corresponded with this comrade for over a year but it was the first time I had the pleasure to meet him face to face. At the Mylius trial a cordon of Scotland Yard detectives stood in front of the court room to prevent Charles Lahr from getting in. They had orders from the home office to keep him out, because he was a very close personal friend of Mr. Mylius. The next time that comrade Lahr comes over from London I have requested him to bring with him,at my expense, a certain Mr. Quin, the head of the Scotland Yard truth-suppression department. I am going to have a long talk with Mr. Quin and tell him exactly what he has to do in order to suppress the *Liberator* in London.

I put comrade Lahr in a corner, and presently in walked comrade Bradford. I told him to look around the room a little, and great was his astonishment when he saw comrade Lahr in the corner.

There we were, all three, newly found comrades, and right then and there was held the first international republican congress. We projected a plan for making a tour of the United States, with comrade Mylius, in the object of trying to persuade that country to overthrow the trusts and to adopt a republic. The congress adjourned from time to time in order to permit the delegates to visit the famous monuments of Paris. We visited the place where the Bastille once stood. They told me that this spot was looked upon as almost sacred in England. I had to put my hand on the comrades to keep them steady because it excited them so much to look on the spot where the people tore down the Bastille. I photographed the comrades here on this famous spot and then we visited the Carnavalet museum where all the old relics of the revolution are kept. We took lunch in the bois de Boulogne. My guests seemed to be very much pleased with the bois de Boulogne. That afternoon we visited the Louvre, and the next day made a trip to Versailles.

We devoted two entire evenings to visiting the boulevards. We patronized the cafés : we sat on the sidewalk sipping refreshments and listening to the violins : we looked at the girls going by. I never knew an Englishman to come over to Paris who did not immediately want to get where he could get a good view of the French girl. Comrade Lahr was the handsomest comrade of our party and consequently all the girls looked at him. Comrade Bradford had heard about the fine dresses that are made in Paris and he wanted to see some. But alas ! he had come to Paris at the wrong time. There are no fine dresses in Paris in August. They are all down at the sea-shore and up in the mountains. As far as I am concerned, I would rather look into comrade Bradford's fighting blue eyes that to see the finest dress that ever went onto a woman's back in Paris. That suits me. There is a good deal of the bulldog quality in these Angles on the other side of channel. Napoleon was a great idiot to think that he could beat them. If Napoleon were living in our day, nobody would know anything about him. Journalism is the force of our day, not armies.

THE YEAR 1889

In the May number we covered the events in prince George's life from April to December inclusive 1888 and from January to June inclusive 1890. We give here his life during 1889. We find him on January 4, 7, 20, 26, February 5, 8, 10, either ad Sandringham or at Marlborough house. On February I he receives appointment to the Northumberland, flag-ship of the channel squadron under command of vice-admiral John K. E. Baird. On February 4 this squadron left Gibraltar for a cruise. On February 14, George embarked on board the troopship Orontes at Portsmouth to join the Northumberland at Gibraltar, and arrived there February 21. Throughout the month of March we have so far found no mention of George's movements. It seems probable that he passed all this time in the Northumberland which during this month was in or about Gibraltar. On April 24 he landed from the Northumberland at Portland and went to Sandringham, where he spent several days driving about in his grandmother's pony carriage. On April 27 he was appointed to the Excellent for a short course in gunnery. *May 2, the princess of Wales and prince George arrived at Marlborough house from Sandringham, to be present at the drawing-room held next day at Buckingham palace. May 3, drawing-room at which Miss Culme-Seymour was presented by the countess of Ravensworth.* May 5, George joined the Excellent at Portsmouth. He was in London on May 17, 24, 28 and 31. *On May 31 he was present at a state concert at Buckingham palace to which Miss Culme-Seymour was invited.* He was in London June 2 and in Paris with his father June 9. In London June 16 and 28. June 29 he " completed " his course of gunnery and torpedo practice on the Excellent. In London July 1, and *present at a state ball, Buckingham palace, July 3, to which Miss Culme-Seymour was invited.* He attends during these days balls, dinners and entertainments too numerous to mention. He is in London throughout July, and at Osborne the first part of August. September 8 he visited the queen at Balmoral on his way to Mar Lodge, Braemar. September 20 he was at Balmoral. September 17 he was appointed to the royal yacht Osborne. The yacht left for Venice September 25, but George proceeded with his father and mother to Denmark September 28. They arrived, overland, at Venice October 15, where they went on board the Osborne. They arrived Athens October 24. The royal party arrived Port Said, October 30. Return to Athens November 7. Reached Paris November 15, and London

November 18. The rest of the year George spent either at Marlborough house or at Sandringham.

Our opinion with regard to the year 1889 is that prince George did not marry Miss Culme-Seymour in that year, but that he was on intimate terms with her during that year.

There is only one period, so far as we can find any indication when it would have been possible for George to marry Mary Elizabeth Culme-Seymour on any of the islands of the Malta group, and that is the period June 9 to June 25, 1890.

Next month we shall deal with that lady's whereabouts during 1890-1893. Our readers may look for exciting developments.

TIVOLI

(continuation)

I recognize no natal bond of union with the plundering plutocrats of Wall street. But I do recognize a bond of union with a dozen Englishmen who are risking their lives and liberties in a fight for the republic on the streets of London. I trust that I shall never glory in the fact that I am an American, but I shall always glory in the fact that I am a republican. If I cannot find people fit to associate with in the monarchical circles of New England and New York I will find them elsewhere. If there be no persons left in Concord and Boston who believe in Emerson, I will find them in Poland and in Egypt and in India. I will acknowledge no person as my fellow-citizen who is not a republican in this universal sense. Just as there was no salvation for a christian outside of the church, so there can be for the modern republican no salvation outside of that republic which is the catholic brotherhood of all republicans. God has made other peoples besides the Americans. He who belongs to many peoples is richer than he who belongs only to one. This is my gospel. There are the Portuguese who have struck a noble blow for liberty and with whom I can work hand in hand for a fine ideal : and I find among the Italians many resolute followers of old Garibaldi and Mazzini, men with a big international outlook, who see that the issue of the hour is republican solidarity and who are eager to carry it to victory.

What a kindness it would be if all the monarchical Englishmen would go over to the United States and join forces with our monarchical plutocrats. A genuine English nobleman who would go over to New York and show the plutocracy how to spend money with easy elegance would be a real missionary. And then if the monarchical Englishmen would only stay over there! What a blessing that would be! England might then become an asylum for all those poor, hated, unfortunate dreamers, called republicans, into whose bosom God has put a longing for the New Jerusalem on earth.

Perhaps, in the foregoing lines, I have been too severe on some of my fellow-countrymen. But my provocation is great. There is a certain type of rich American who comes to Europe, spends three months tearing about in an automobile, and then goes home to resume his career of commercial and political bribery, plunder and success. He gives me great annoyance — not on account of his personal conversation, because I never allow him to come within speaking distance. What annoys me is to see him tearing around as if he owned the world. If there is a king to be crowned anywhere he is sure to go and see the show. If he can sell his daughter to some worthless debauched sport who owns a title and a castle, that will make him very happy. He wants a big navy. He voted for and paid all his workmen to vote for the annexation of the Philippine islands, outright, without any consideration whatever for the wishes of their inhabitants. He is without ideals, and ridicules those who have them. Yet he is often trying so hard to be a gentleman. He thinks that the first requisite for being a gentleman is to be rich. He does not know that it is not possible to be a gentleman without ideals, and that is why I pity him. He can be a Rockfeller or a Carnegie or a Morgan without ideals, but not a gentleman. He has a hankering to be a gentleman, because that will give him a little elevation over the other plutocrats, but at the same time he gives the greatest honor to being a successful business man. He tries to do the impossible. In order to be a gentleman you must give the greatest honor to being a gentleman.

Going out to Tivoli in the train I was much interested in watching the countrymen working in the fields. It is a wonder to me how they can make so much wheat grow with the primitive tools which they use. They are a gentle folk, these laborers, and I saw the train officials herding a lot of them into a third-class car just as I have seen them herded in the United States. They were clappering about in homely foot-gear and carrying their provender in white meal-sacks slung over their backs. I suppose that these are the famous people we hear so much about in the United States, the poor down-trodden peasants who do not know how to read and write. They are certainly very beautiful when you see them working in the fields. I do not believe that there has been any improvement in farming methods in this country since the days of Cincinnatus, but one does not come to Italy to see Mc Cornick harvesting machines. I do not know any sight in the world more beautiful than to see a band of these swarthy Italian country-people, men and women, dressed in easy fitting bright colored garments, going through a field of golden grain on the Roman Campagna with hand-sickles. Think of cutting down fifty-acre fields of wheat with hand-sickles ! I suppose they are doing that sort of thing for the benefit of American artists who come here to paint. When, on the Roman Campagna, surrounded by all the delicious music of nature, I see, placed in a vista whose background of misty hills is distinguished from the sky only by a blue of a deeper tint, a woman, beautiful in the bloom which comes to the tillers of the soil, bending low to cut the yellow grain with a hand-sickle, the artistic side of my nature responds at once, but every fibre of my practical nature revolts. Would that I might give these farming folk some improved Chicago harvesters and some republican tracts !

I think I may say, everything considered, although to say it is unpatriotic, that the cascades of Tivoli please me more than the falls of Niagara. The cascades of Tivoli gush forth from bosky caverns. They fall through the air in foaming, silvery curves. They hit lower benches of mossy rocks and leap off again into space. Then you have another series of foamy, silvery curves lower down. Niagra falls doesn't do anything of this kind. It plunges. It roars. It terrifies. But Tivoli charms. I do not say that Niagra is not magnificently impressive. I wish to be entirely just to Niagra. I have crossed it several times on the suspension bridge and each time have been nearly scared to death. But what makes the balance weigh in favor of Tivoli in my opinion, is that at Tivoli you are in close communion with the gods, Neptune, Diana, Juno and all their cousins. I know that there are a great many people who do not believe in the existence of these gods. They say that they are against reason and natural science. Herbert Spencer and Huxley have demonstrated that Neptune and Diana are the rankest nonsense. Never mind. When you go to Tivoli you must not go as a piece of arid, petrified logic. You must go to look at life the way Horace and Ovid looked at life and Horace and Ovid knew that there were gods here in Tivoli. As a matter of fact, Tivoli is sacred to Neptune. He has a cave here which I visited.

During my trip, the sun was very nice to me. When I was on the hot dusty road, he went under the clouds, but when I was wandering through dank caverns and over rocks slippery with the spray of the cascades he came forth with yellow effulgence, shooting his rays through leafy curtains and filling the torrential gorge with greenish lights. I found the stony projections, where the spray beat full in my face, delicious places to cool off on a hot day. I know it to be a fact that Neptune spent much time here at Tivoli and continually used these cascades of the Anio as a shower-bath.

But there is another reason why I put Tivoli ahead of Niagra. At Tivoli you can see, perched up on a rock over the water-falls, a temple to Vesta that is two thousand years old. Niagra has no accessories as charming as this. There is, it is true, at Niagra a dynamo which supplies the city of Buffalo with forty thousand wats of electricity daily (I think it is forty thousand wats). But the dynamo, useful as it is, does not contribute to the beauty of the waterfalls. We have not yet as a people begun to adorn our landscapes with objects like this temple of Vesta. We are told that that will come. Perhaps it will, when we love money-making less. As a general principle, we Americans never do things for glory or for beauty. What we do, we do for money. A five-dollar gold piece as a rule looks better to us than a temple of Vesta. It is a great mistake that we are making. We ought to consider the Italians. The Italians love to beautify all the surroundings of their life. They give romance and poetry their proper places. The degree of book-learning, of schooling, is low here, and so also is the rate of drunkenness, suicide, insanity, bankruptcies and divorces. Divorce does not exist under the law of Italy. The Italian, listening to a hand-organ as he sips his wine under a vine-clad pergola, does not think what a wretched creature his wife is, how miserably he is mated, and that he must immediately apply for a divorce. He diminishes enormously the misery

and the tragedy of life by this element of gaiety. The buildings are bright with flags. No home so humble in Italy that it does not have a scroll or a flowery fresco or a tinkling fountain. The little wine carts of which one passes hundreds daily are freshly painted with garlands of roses, and the horses are loaded down with tassels and bells. Each horse too carries at the end of his fill a bundle of hay or green alfalfa from which he takes an occasional nibble. Poverty is bad and hard to bear but the Italian knows that a little paint, a little gaiety, a little music of dripping water, makes the burden of poverty less grinding and less brutal. It is the fashion in Paris to condemn Italian music as being vulgar, sugary and sentimental, and to praise German music as being all that is elegant and classical. But a German cannot write gay music. German music is deep, powerful and sad. It reflects the German temperament. Italian music is gay. That is its charm, and it is a rare charm.

There is one respect in which Italian gaiety here in Rome gets on one's nerves. I allude to the ringing of the church bells. There are four hundred churches in Rome, each one of which is provided with a set of monstrous bells. Every quarter of an hour there is a terrific detonation all over Rome from these church-bells. The racket begins at five o'clock in the morning. I suppose the purpose of this frightful banging and clanging is to let protestants know that there is a catholic church in Rome. But it gets to be a little tiresome.

Having spoken of the prettily decorated wine-carts, I am tempted to speak of the use of wine. Everyone in Italy drinks wine. The people would as soon not use salt on their meat as not use wine. I do not justify wine-drinking. I do not believe that alcohol in any quantity or form is in the least necessary for healthy people. But I have not seen one case of even slight intoxication in Italy. The Italianas know how to use alcohol with moderation. That is one thing which we Americans with our public school system and young mens' christian associations have not yet learned. By the foregoing remark, it is not intimated that every American is a drunkard. But life under high pressure and constant dollar-making, without poetry, romance or temples of Vesta for the relaxation and refreshment of the soul, drive thousands of Americans to drink and to suicide. It is the curse of the dollar with us. When shall we ever escape from it? When shall we take this brute by the throat and throttle him?

One of the earliest things which I can look back to in life is the recollection of my grandmother teaching me, one Sunday afternoon, that liquor-drinking was a sin. My grandfather, an austere Puritan, was the son of a New Hampshire farmer who had died a drunkard. He spent in drink what ought to have been spent in food for his children. When there was no bread in the house, my great-grandmother took her children into a closet and prayed to God for help. This made its impression on my grandfather. Early in life he signed the pledge. I remember how uncomfortable he made me feel one day when I made the ill-timed remark that in my opinion pledge-signing was a mistake. My grandfather was nearing seventy at that time and pledge-signing had worked well in his case. I was thirteen. Under the circumstances I had no right to have an opinion on the subject at all.

My grandparents professed a very rigid form of orthodoxy. There was a pew in church marked " Holton " and I can remember how the mahogany at the end of this pew shone like a looking-glass from the constant polishing it got from my grandfather's coat. My grandmother would not use a street-car on the Sabbath for fear of violating one of the commandments, and it worried her that the horses had to be hitched into the carriage to carry her to church. My grandfather promised to pay me one silver dollar if I would learn all the ten commandments by heart. It was the first dollar that I ever earned, and (I was almost going to say) the last.

I was not such a perfectly stainless child as these circumstances would indicate. When I was thirteen years old — it was about the time of the painful clash with my grandfather on the ethics of pledge-signing — I stole off with one my cousins to a German beer resort in the neighborhood, where we bought a quart of beer which we put into a tin pail. The Germans in that region always carry their beer about in tin pails. It was a hot afternoon and I remember how good the beer looked as the bar-keeper let it come foaming and gushing from the big faucet into our tin pail. I think the bar-tender asked us who the beer was for and I think we told him it was for our grandfather. My cousin and I took it (shall I relate it?) took the pail into the most retired shed that we could find and it is not necessary for me to state here what became of the beer. We had been taught that liquor-drinking was a sin and we wanted to find out what this particular sin tasted like. From that day we ceased to be little innocent boys and became little men, or shall I say, little devils who had tasted of deceit and stealth. I have never made this confession before, but now that it is made, now that it is on the paper, I do not mean to tear it out. It will not embarrass anyone but myself, for my cousin has been, these many summers, in a better place than in this valley of sorrows.

I must tell here how my grandparents came to be married, because if I do not tell the story here I am afraid it will never be recorded. They met on a boat going from Buffalo to Detroit. My grandmother's father had been down to New York to buy goods for his store in Dexter, Michigan, and he had taken my grandmother with him. They were on their return. My grandfather was " going west " to make his fortune. He was a young man, without money, who had worked a year in a shop in Buffalo. When he met my grandmother on the boat he was heading for Wisconsin which in those days was the frontier country. These two young people spent a good deal of time, while on the boat, playing backgammon. There was nothing out of the ordinary in two young people playing a few games of backgammon on a boat going from Buffalo to Detroit. My grandmother, with her father, left the boat at the latter place. She said good-bye to young Mr. Holton, whom she had no reason to believe that she should ever see or hear of again. Mr. Holton continued on his journey out to the wild country.

Two years passed, during which my grandmother did not receive any word form, or news of, Mr. Holton. Finally, one day, in Dexter, Michigan, her brother came home and said : " Lucinda, do you remember that young Mr. Holton that came with you on the boat from Buffalo to Detroit? "

"Why yes ", answered Lucinda, pretending to make an effort to remember. " Now that you mention his name, I think I do recall him. "

" Well ", continued her brother, " Do you know, he is here in Dexter and he wishes to come and call on you. "

" You don't say! " exclaimed my grandmother, as if that were the first time that Mr. Holton had come into her thoughts for two years.

It is strange how some women will seek to dissemble and deceive others with regard to their deepest thoughts and emotions.

She had been waiting for him. For two years she had been thinking and dreaming of Mr. Holton. She thought he might come, and he did come. It is extraordinary what complications will sometimes arise from a few games of backgammon!

My grandfather was an idealist. He was always helping poor young men to get an education. During the fifties, when the slavery question was boiling, he helped many a poor black man to escape from the south to Canada by the " underground railway ". He was, like myself, a subversive person, during the fifties. He was asked to resign from one church because of his anti-slavery doctrines. He built a church of his own where anti-slavery doctrines were preached twice every Sunday. Then he sent out a colony of five hundred men to fight to make Kansas a free state, and those people who fought on the side of John Brown, founded a town in Kansas which today bears my grandfather's name. When I was six years old my grandparents took me with them to California. We stopped on the way at Holton, Kansas. I remember the train got in late at night. But there was a crowd at the station with torch-lights and a brassband. My grandparents and I got into an omnibus and were driven through the streets of Holton, Kansas, followed by the band and the torch-light procession. Someday I mean to go to Holton, Kansas, and I shall be very much disappointed if there is not a band and a torch-light procession at the station to meet me.

(To be continued.)

— Through inadvertence, the address of the editor of the *Liberator* was omitted in the last three numbers.

The men are ripe of Saxon kind
To build an equal state — *Emerson.*
I will have never a noble,
No lineage counted great;
Fishers and choppers and ploughmen
Shall constitute a state — *Emerson.*

Le Gérant : Georges PAGNIER.

Paris. — Typ. PH. RENOUARD, 19, rue des Saints-Pères.